

Remarks:

Applicant has studied the Office Action, and has amended the claims to distinctively claim the subject matter of the invention. By virtue of this amendment, claims 21, 22, 25, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34 and 37 are amended; and new claims 38-42 are added. Claims 21, 32, 34, and 38 are presented in independent form, with claims 22-31, 33, 35-37, and 39-42 respectively depending there from.

No new matter has been added. Support for the new claims and the amendments is found within the specification and the drawings. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to the word "bee" on page 2 of the specification. The specification has been amended to overcome the Examiner's objection. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

§103 Rejection(s):

Claims 21-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Normura et al. (US 6,658,409) in view of Klausner et al. (US 5,572,576), in further view of Youn (US-2002/0019251), in further view of Khoshbin (US-2004/0104808), and in further view of Hama (US-2002/0061771).

With respect to claims 21, 32 and 34, the Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to modify Nomura et al. in light of Klausner et al's arrow key 34 for "selecting a caller's name." Based on our careful review of the above two cited references, this ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Nomura et al. disclose a pager unit for displaying text messages on a pager display in addition to information identifying the name and phone number of the sender of the message and other related information such as time of message delivery, etc. (FIGS. 28, 29 of Nomura). The Examiner concedes that Nomura et al. fail to teach the claimed scrolling feature (page 3 of the Office Action).

Klausner et al. disclose a caller ID type telephone answering device. It is important to note that the Klausner device is designed for recording and playing voice messages, only. That is, the Klausner et al. device is not used for receiving or displaying text messages. The caller ID information for each voice message is displayed so that a user can choose to listen to the voice messages based on the caller ID information, rather than listening to the messages in chronological order. (See Abstract of Klausner et al.)

The Examiner refers to arrow key 34 shown on FIG. 1 that allows a user to scroll through and select an entry in the caller ID information list displayed on the telephone. (See columns 10-12 of Klausner). It is not clear from the Office Action, how a person of reasonable skill in the art would be motivated to modify Nomura's text messaging pager based on a scroll key used in the voice messaging device of Klausner.

It is well settled that the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Since obviousness may not be established by hindsight reconstruction or conjecture, Applicant invites the Examiner to point out the alleged motivation to combine with specificity,¹ or alternatively provide a reference or affidavit in support thereof, pursuant to MPEP §2144.03.²

Referring to amended independent claims 21, 32, 34, and new claim 38, neither of the cited references teach, suggest, or disclose a message display method in a mobile communication terminal, wherein the method comprises (1) receiving a first message comprising at least one of message identification information and message content; (2) automatically scroll-displaying said at least one of the message identification information and the message content on a display of the mobile communication terminal after a predetermined time period has elapsed, so that (3) said at least one of the message identification information and the message content are scroll-displayed until end of said at least one of the message identification information and the message content is reached automatically.³

¹ *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospital*, 221 U.S.P.Q. 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

² "The rationale supporting an obviousness rejection may be based on common knowledge in the art or "well-known" prior art . . . If the applicant traverses such an assertion the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position. When a rejection is based on facts within the personal knowledge of the examiner . . . the facts must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by an affidavit from the examiner."

³ The enumeration does not denote the importance of a specific order of performance of any step of the method claim.

Accordingly, claims 21, 32, 34, as amended, and new claim 38 distinguish over the cited references and should be in condition for allowance. Claims 22-31, 33, 35-37, and 39-42 respectively depending on claims 21, 32, 34, and 38 should be also in condition for allowance by the virtue of being dependent on allowable base claims.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have expressly argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: January 4, 2005

By: 
Lew Edward V. Macapagal, Esq.
Registration No. 55,416

Customer No. 035884

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA
801 S. Figueroa Street, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Telephone: (213) 623-2221
Facsimile: (213) 623-2211